COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

ORIGINAL

PUBLIC BROADCASTING RATE PROCEEDINGS:

1111-20th Street N.W. Room 450 Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, June 6, 1978

The hearing in the above-entitled matter commenced at 4:20 p.m.

BEFORE:

COMMISSIONER THOMAS C. BRENNAN, Chairman
COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS E. COULTER
COMMISSIONER MARY LOU BURG
COMMISSIONER CLARENCE L. JAMES, JR.
COMMISSIONER FRANCES GARCIA

PRESENT:

BERNARD KORMAN

I. FRED KOENIGSBERG
BENJAMIN ZELENKO

Counsel for ASCAP

ERIC SMITH
ALLEN LATMAN

Counsel for PBS

ALSO PRESENT:

Eugene N. Alienikoff, PBS

RECORDED VOTES

MOTION	PAGE
Amendment to 304.3 to insert \$1,250,000	11
Amendment to provide for yearly cost-of-living adjustment	13
Amendment to 304.1 to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustment	15
Motion to add Subsection C to Section 304.3	29
Amendment to motion to add Subsection C to Section 304.3	33
Hotion to delete Section 304.4	34
Motion on adoption of 304.3	48
Motion authorizing the Chair to make technical and perfecting amendments	49

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The meeting will come to order.

All the parties with a personal interest in this subject

matter were personally notified of this meeting. Because of

the requirements of the Copyright Act, it was not possible to

give other public notice.

We enter a new phase of the proceeding this afternoon, the consideration and adoption of the final rule, including the schedule of rates and terms.

A draft of the final rule has been circulated to the Commissioners, and I direct that it be made a portion of the record at this point.

If there is no objection, the text will be made pending business for purposes of amendment.

I will now recognize Commissioners for the purpose of offering amendments to the final rule, or for purposes of debate. It may facilitate the procedure if we were to consider amendments in the order in which the sections appear in the final rule.

Are there any amendments to Section One and Two?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, we've reached Section.

Three, which is concerned with the performance of ASCAP

musical compositions.

It became apparent in recent days that there is no

formula that commands general support in this body, whether it be based on ratings, revenue, use of music or population.

More importantly, each of those formulas, despite the best efforts of their sponsors, suffer from inherent limitations.

Consequently, at the meeting yesterday, some of the commissioners were confronted with several options. One option was to pursue the course followed by Commissioner Burg to propose that we abandon the efforts to device a workable formula, and instead, adopt a flat payment based upon the record in this proceeding.

I decided to explore another option, the utilization of Commissioner Garcia's revenue formula, and the determination of the initial payment to be made by Public Broadcasting to ASCAP, which amount would then remain in force for the term of this schedule, other than for the 1981 inflation adjustment.

When it became apparent that this enterprise was not serving its intended purpose, I withdrew the motion, although I subsequently voted for the motion when it was offered by Commissioner Coulter.

Commissioner Coulter's amendment has, in my opinion, effectively dealt with some of the problems inherent in the utilization of a revenue formula. At the very least, it reduces the frequency and number of disputes.

But, on reflection, I have determined that the opportunities for unproductive disputes will persist under this formula.

Consequently, I have decided that Commissioner

Garcia's revenue formula should in no way be employed in

determining the amount of the payment, nor should any specific
or single formula be utilized in that determination.

Rather, we should, in my judgment, adopt a flat payment which will be developed generally on the basis of two criteria -- one, the general record made in this proceeding as to the determination of the reasonable value of the performance of ASCAP music by Public Broadcasting, and as a benchmark or indication of what would be a reasonable payment to consider the collective totals reached by the various proposals -- population, revenue, various variations thereof -- that were advanced during these proceedings, but in no way, and in no respect, to link the final payment to a specific formula.

Among other virtues, I believe this will further reduce the possibilities for disputes.

I, therefore, propose an amendment to Section 304-3, which would strike the sum currently appearing in the draft final rule, and insert in lieu thereof, the sum \$1,250,000.

The amendment is the pending business. Is there any debate on the amendment?

•

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: The revenue proposal submitted to you yesterday for your consideration was, in my judgment, a sound business approach method. It is regretful that this Tribunal chose to ignore that and go instead with a flat fee.

The final result was certainly not what my proposal to this Tribunal was advocated. My real purpose in speaking to you here today is that those people most affected by this decision are the artists of America.

Both parties -- ASCAP and Public Broadcasting -- are non-profit organizations. ASCAP has testified that 80 percent on every dollar is returned to their members.

I contend that my proposal was a simple one, certainly as a business approach conveying music, for this is a difficult situation.

Arguments have been made that it is too much money. I disagree that my formula would have skyrocketed the fees outside, because the formula rates were set so low. We were talking about three-tenths of one cent for public television and four-tenths of one cent for radio for each dollar.

Again, too much money for whom? Certainly, it would have been too much money for me to pay. The Tribunal has been given an opportunity to pioneer in a field which

is new in this country.

It is true that all the commissioners have approached the subject in good faith, and have taken their responsibilities very seriously. Of course, the results cannot satisfy all the commissioners and all parties equally. However, hopefully, what we have done here yesterday, and are about to do today, will be without prejudice and precedence.

In five years, when both parties have an opportunity to get used to the idea of paying this money, I hope that this Tribunal will seek the opportunity to strike a proper balance.

And while I cannot support the pending motion as being a fair and equitable rate, and giving to the membership of ASCAP their fair value, I hope that in 1982 this Tribunal will adopt a simple revenue method.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Any further debate on the amendment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, we will proceed -- Commissioner Burg?

COMMISSIONER BURG: I, for a long time in these proceedings, have been on the record, both publicly and in informal discussions in the office, that I opposed any form of a revenue base to this rate schedule.

My colleagues have been aware of this. I think

everybody here in this room has been aware of it. It has been an article of faith with me. It is not directed towards the members, either individually or collectively, of ASCAP.

I have nothing against the authors and composers as people.

I do not want to penalize them.

But part of my resistance to the entire concept of revenue was that it did, indeed, inflate the final figure.

I must say that if the roles of the two participating parties in these proceedings were reversed, in terms of
dollar amounts, in terms of what they were asking for and
what they offered, I would feel exactly the same way.

I initially proposed a market population concept, which would yielded somewhere in the neighborhood of one million to one point one million. I was happy with this figure. I was satisfied with it. I felt for the initial five-year period it was fair to both ASCAP and to Public Broadcasting.

Yesterday, I voted and accepted a figure of 1.224 million dollars. I swallowed hard then. I find I'm swallowing a little harder today because that figure has just moved up to 1.250, I believe it was.

I will buy that figure, and I will vote for it, reluctantly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Thank you, Commissioner. Any further debate on the amendment?

Chairman.

2 Cha

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: I'm concerned, as I've expressed here before, that we are not, really, by the adoption of this rate, fulfilling the mandate the Congress has turned over to us.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: I'd like to say something, Mr.

Our mandate, and throughout the testimony of all the witnesses, and my concept of the examination, I thought it was to come up with a fair and reasonable rate and value for what the artists are entitled to.

The only benchmark, I think, that was offered into evidence under which we could logically come up with any type of rate was the one offered on the formula based on what the commercial rate was.

Over the years, almost 34 years, commercial broadcasters have been paying for the use of musical repertoires from the various performing rights societies.

I think the evidence was overwhelmingly presented—and certainly not to my satisfaction contradicted — that if a tune has a certain value in the commercial market, then that is the market value, whether it's used by a commercial station or a non-profit station.

I'm also mindful of the mandate in the reports by both the House and the Senate that any rate that we took into

consideration would not be done with the eyes of attempting or the guise of attempting to subsidize public broadcasting.

I think the record reflects that there is little supportive justification for a flat fee that has no basis, has no relevancy to value, because it's a value that is not predicated upon anything.

And the only benchmark, as Commissioner Garcia indicated in her remarks earlier, that is logically supported by this record, is the one that was offered by ASCAP, which is predicated upon the commercial value.

So that to take a position that a flat rate -- and I can equate the difference. We are not talking about a voluntary agreement where a flat rate was negotiated; we are talking about a rate that we have to promulgate and sustain as being and giving fair value -- we're not fulfilling the mandate that was given to us by Congress.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Any further debate on the amendment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, we will vote on the amendment.

The amendment is to strike the sum which currently appears in 304.3, and insert in lieu thereof the sum \$1,250,000.

We shall have a recorded vote.

1	Commissioner Coulter?
2	COMMISSIONER COULTER: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Burg?
4	COMMISSIONER BURG: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James?
6	COMMISSIONER JAMES: No.
7	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia?
8	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No.
9	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair votes aye.
10	The "ayes" are three; the "nays" are two. The
11	amendment is adopted.
12	The rule is open to further amendments. Are there
13	further amendments? Commissioner Coulter?
14	COMMISSIONER COULTER: I'd like to make the amend-
15	ment that the that this sum be subject to inflation
16	adjustment annually.
17	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Hay I inquire of the Commissioner
18	if he is intending to limit the yearly adjustment to the
19	ASCAP formula, or would that apply to all the fixed sums?
20	COMMISSIONER COULTER: In this instance I was re-
21	ferring only to the ASCAP formula, and I'd like to restrict
22	it to that.
23	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If another commissioner wishes
24	to expand the amendment, we can do that either by amendment
25	to your amendment or by separate motion.

1	COMMISSIONER COULTER: Can we just handle this one?
2	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The pending amendment is an
3	amendment to extend only the ASCAP fee on a yearly cost-of-
4	living adjustment.
5	Is there debate on the amendment?
6	COMMISSIONER JAMES: I think it is discriminatory.
7	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Perhaps the Commissioner might
8	wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.
9	COMMISSIONER JAMES: The reason I say I think it is
10	discriminatory, I think if you there is well, let me
11	ask the Commissioner first. Is he amending 304.11, or is he
12	amending this current rule here? What is his motion addressed
13	to?
14	COMMISSIONER COULTER: My intention was to amend
15	the current rule here. If 304.11 is concerned
16	COMMISSIONER JAMES: Well, 304 is an inflationary
17	rate that deals with certain
18	COMMISSIONER COULTER: I know. I know.
19	COMMISSIONER JAMES: And what you're doing is
20	giving preferential
21	COMMISSIONER COULTER: I see what you mean.
22	I'm amending 304.3, and if we intend to amend
23	304.11, I'd like to do that separately.
24	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Commissioner has that right.
25	The pending amendment is to 304.3. You've heard the

1	Commissioner's amendment. Is there any discussion on the
2	amendment?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, we will proceed to a
5	vote on the amendment, which is, in essence, to have a yearly
6	cost-of-living adjustment for the PBS payment to ASCAP.
7	Commissioner Coulter?
8	COMMISSIONER COULTER: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Burg.
10	COMMISSIONER BURG: Yes.
11	CHAIRHAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James?
12	COMMISSIONER JAMES: No.
13	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia?
14	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair votes yes.
16	The "yeas" are four; the "nays" one. The amend-
17	ment is adopted.
18	Are there further amendments?
19	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Chairman?
20	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia.
21	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're moving on to Section
22	304; is that correct?
23	CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Yes, if you want to.
24	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Section 304.11, cost-of-
25	living. I think Commissioner James had a good observation,

1 the fact that we may be discriminating if we only allow to 2 one party and not the others. Therefore, I'm making an 3 amendment that this be on a yearly basis, and strike out 4 "November 1, 1980" and make it yearly, to be effective 5 January 1st of each year. 6 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Would Commissioner Coulter feel 7 that there would be a need for his separate amendment if we 8 have a provision in 304.11? 9 COMMISSIONER COULTER: No. 10 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Then, would you include in your 11 motion, Commissioner Garcia, that your --12 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yes, Mr. --13 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: -- would delete the Coulter 14 amendment from 304.3. COMMISSIONER JAMES: Then I'll withdraw my "no" 15 vote, Mr. Chairman, because that was my concern. 16 17 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair so understood. 18 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 304.11, Cost-Of-Living, be amended to reflect cost-19 of-living yearly for all parties dealing with the Public 20 Broadcasting entity, which would incorporate Commissioner 21 Coulter's prior amendment to the ASCAP flat fee. 22 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: You heard the amendment. 23 there any debate on the amendment? 24

(No response.)

The rule is open to further amendments. Are there

further amendments?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I have none, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, the Chair would like to go through the table of contents and the general subject matter of the final rule.

We will invite counsel to attempt to follow, as best they can, and at the end of the recitation, if there are issues which counsel feel have not been addressed that should be included, we'll be glad to hear such statements.

Section One is devoted to the general scope of the final rule. We have previously made clear that our final rule is not a license agreement, and that the rights granted to public broadcasting are those set forth in 17 U. S. C. 118(d).

Consequently, the section devoted to scope consists merely of a reference to the rights and activities set forth in the statute.

Section Two is the definition of a public broad-casting entity, which conforms to the definition in the Copyright Act.

Section Three is concerned with ASCAP musical compositions. As I indicated in my question to Mr. Latman yesterday, the heading of this and similar sections reads, "The performance of ASCAP musical compositions by PBS and its stations, and NPR and its stations."

There are several subsections of Part Three, all of which have been discussed extensively.

Section Four is concerned with the performance of musical compositions in the repertory of the Italian Book Corporation.

The final rule provides, as in the case of ASCAP, for a flat payment under a blanket license.

The Commissioners have determined that under the statute we cannot discriminate in such matters as record-keeping by public broadcasting entities, or the rights of copyright owners, however small they might be.

On the other hand, we feel that we certainly have discretion to be guided by test of reason, and there is nothing in this record to suggest that we ought to impose a requirement that the Italian Book Corporation receive separate accounts of standard cue sheets.

However, to comply with the requirement of the statute as we see them, we do provide that if PBS or NPR is requested by the Italian Book Corporation to examine such cue sheets which those stations otherwise are required to maintain, that such right of access shall be granted to the representatives of the Italian Book Corporation.

And in Section Five we have a similar provision with respect to the totally unaffiliated copyright owners.

As was previously determined, this body believes

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

that we have a responsibility to establish a schedule of rates and terms for all copyright owners, whether or not their existence is currently known to this body.

As to the fee schedule for the unaffiliated, we followed, as we feel we would have to, a per-performance schedule, which is similar to the rates suggested in the PBS presentation.

COMMISSIONER BURG: There is a question.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Yes?

MR. ALEINIKOFF: May I just ask, Mr. Chairman, if you have a blanket license fee for the Italian Book Corporation?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Yes. Yes. A lump sum. And since it's no secret, the amount is \$600.

304.6, Performance of Musical Compositions by Public Broadcasting Entities Licensed to Colleges or Universities.

Subsection A is concerned with the scope of Section Six, and indicates that it applies to non-commercial stations which are not affiliated with NPR.

PBS in their presentation -- in a footnote, I believe -- made reference to some highschools or other educational institutions having broadcasting licenses.

And although we have, throughout this proceeding, spoke of colleges and universities, if there are any such

highschool institutions, they likewise are covered by this provision.

The rate schedule for the colleges was discussed yesterday, and I need not cover that ground again.

As with the PBS and the NPR stations, we believe that there is an obligation to supply copyright owners with music use reports, but we provide that ASCAP, BMI and SESAC each shall not in any one calendar year request more than 10 stations to furnish a report for one week of each calendar year.

Section Seven is devoted to the performance of musical compositions by other public broadcasting entities, which means the unaffiliated stations. The rates were discussed yesterday. The recordkeeping provisions are similar to those for the colleges.

And in both the college and the unaffiliated sections, we have the language concerning the protection of the voluntary license agreements that was previously discussed.

Section Eight establishes rates and terms for the recording of non-dramatic performances and displays of musical works on and for the radio and television programs of public broadcasting entities, whether or not synchronization or time relationship, with visual or oral content, and for the making, reproduction and distribution of copies and

phono-records of public broadcasting programs, containing such recorded non-dramatic performances and displays of musical works solely for the transmission by public broadcasting entities as defined in the statute.

The rates and terms established in this schedule include the making of the reproduction described in 17 U.S.C. 118(d)3, which is the seven-day provision.

This is followed by the royalty schedule. As to this, a determination had to be made as to whether the rates for recordings by national programs of PBS should be reduced, since under our schedule, payments are also required for recordings by local and regional stations.

We have determined not to reduce the rates for the recordings by PBS for national programs.

The schedule of fees covers broadcast use for a period of three years, following the first broadcast. We have language as to additional payments, which is similar to the language in the Harry Fox Agreement.

And because this particular schedule expires on December 31, 1982, we provide that uses which are subsequent to that date shall be subject to the rates established in this schedule.

As was previously indicated, the Commissioners have basically accepted the arguments made by music publishers and other copyright owners that they are entitled to receive

5

reports of the use of their musical compositions for local and regional programs, as well as for national programs.

We defined the content of the standard cue sheets, which is similar to the language in the voluntary agreements.

The rule accepts the recommendation that cue sheets shall be deposited with the Copyright Royalty Tribunal.

Section Nine deals with the terms and rates of royalty payments for pictorial, graphic, and sculptural works. The rates and terms established in this schedule include the making of the reproduction described in 17 U.S.C. 118(d)3.

Since the royalty schedule has not been discussed recently, I will read the schedule for such uses in a PBS-distributed program.

"For a feature display of a work, \$30. For back-ground and montage display, \$15. For use of a work for program identification, or for thematic use, \$60.

"For the display of an art reproduction, copyrighted separately" -- and, of course, this is the transparancy problem -- "\$20."

Then, there is a lower schedule for uses in other than PBS programs, and certain of these terms are then defined.

This is followed by the provisions as to the use reports. And, again, the filing of use reports with the

CRT. On these issues, as this Commissioner previously indicated, he has doubts as to the productive value of certain of this reporting, and I will come to another provision on that subject in a few minutes.

As was previously resolved with regard to the visual works, the rates of the schedule are for unlimited broadcast use for a period of three years from the date of the first broadcast.

Section 10 is concerned with the unknown copyright owners, and requires PBS, NPR, and their stations, to retain the required fee in a segregated trust account for a period of three years from the date of the required payment.

No claim is valid after the expiration of the three-year period, and public broadcasting entities may establish a joint trust fund for such purposes.

Concern was expressed by commissioners that there could be an incentive on the part of public broadcasting not to locate copyright owners, and the section provides that the public broadcasting entities shall make information concerning the fees deposited in the trust fund available to this body, upon the request of this body.

Section 11 is the cost-of-living adjustment, which was recently amended to provide for a yearly cost-of-living adjustment, based on the Consumer Price Index, the U.S. City Average or items, Irving Consumer Index.

Section 12 is concerned with notice of restrictions on use of reproductions of transmission programs. The report of the House Committee invites this body to adopt regulations on that subject, and in substance the provision provides that any public broadcasting entity, which, pursuant to 118, supplies a reproduction of a transmission program, shall include with each copy a warning notice stating that the reproductions may be used for a period of no more than seven days from the specified date of the transmission, and that the reproductions must be destroyed by the user at the end of that period.

Section 13 is concerned with the amendment of certain regulations of the CRT, and provides that subject to the Copyright Act, the APA and our rules of procedure, the CRT at anytime may amend, modify, or repeal regulations which were adopted, by which copyright owners may receive reasonable notice of the use of their works, and under which records of such use shall be kept by public broadcasting entities.

Section 14 concerns the issuance of interpretative regulations. And, again, with the same restrictions, provide that the CRT may at any time, either on its own motion, or the motion of a person having a significant interest in the subject matter issue such interpretative regulations as may be necessary or useful to the implementation of this part.

It is further provided that such regulations may not alter the schedule of rates and terms of royalty payments established by this part.

Finally, Section 15 concerns the report to the Congress on the implementation of Section 118.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Does any party wish to suggest additional subjects that can easily be included in the rule?

Mr. Korman?

MR. KORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether consideration was given to reflecting the possible change which can result from addition of new stations, either through construction, during the term of this agreement, or stations which are not now represented by NPR, possibly because of the standards that NPR has for eligibility, which relates to the minimum budget and minimum number of paid staff, and so forth. I believe that's all in the record. Either because of changes in those minimum requirements, or whatever reason, we may find literally hundreds of radio stations which, under the schedule that you have just described, would be required to pay separate fees merely by joining NPR. Unless there is some adjustment factor provided, there would be significant, or possibly significant loss of fees to ASCAP's members.

I raise the question whether consideration was

given to that question or those questions.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: No, it was not, because until yesterday, we were thinking primarily in terms of various formulas which would have dealt with the particular problem that you have just indicated.

Have you a proposal to make at this time?

MR. KORMAN: I do, Mr. Chairman.

Of course, the problem would not exist under the proposal of Commissioner Garcia. It occurs to me that perhaps the way of dealing with it is for this very limited purpose to use the percentage which would seem satisfactory to a majority of the members of the Tribunal yesterday so that there could be an add-on for new stations.

I would suggest that it be based on three percent in the case of television, and four percent in the case of radio of the first year's budget.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: That would be added on to the flat base?

MR. KORMAN: Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER BURG: First year budget of what?
That particular station in question?

MR. KORMAN: Yes. I don't believe we're talking about large sums of money, obviously. But there would otherwise be a loop hole.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Does Public Broadcasting desire to be heard before a Commissioner is recognized to offer an amendment?

MR. ALIENIKOFF: We'd like to be heard if it is convenient for you to hear us right now.

> CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: As always.

MR. ALIENIKOFF: I think initially I would like to say just one or two words about the whole approach of additional stations or for that matter reduction in the number of stations.

It does seem to us that there are questions in both ways and I think you will notice in the licenses, the voluntary licenses, where this idea comes from that, there is provision for either reduction or addition in number of stations.

We're not sure what will happen in the future any more than Mr. Korman is about what stations will belong.

Let me review just once more. Right now PBS has as its membership virtually 100 percent of the stations in this country. There are very few additional stations' licenses outstanding to be picked up and activitated. may be some some place, but we certainly don't know of any great expectations for this in numbers.

Our understanding of what the Commission has done today, the Tribunal has done today, was to take a flat figure. Just again, contrary to what's in the voluntary agreement where this kind of an adjustment is made, there is no upward or downward adjustment for cost of living. And, actually, in

a

our negotiations the adjustment for numbers of stations was in substitution in our mind for that kind of a cost of living increase, so that we thought we had taken care of it by that time.

In this case, it seems to me we are getting a double kind of increase or decrease formula.

As far as radio is concerned, we recognize that there are some 600 stations or, as we have said, small or some of them larger, according to colleges that may choose at some point to come over and become members of NPR.

It is our feeling that you have set fees for those stations. The fact that they become NPR members is no different from when they were non-NPR members and therefore the easiest way to make that adjustment where there is a substantial number of stations, and it might be unfair to keep the same kind of licenses fee, would be to add that number of what had been paid to ASCAP, since some of those fees are for all music use provided and proportionate to the NPR or the PBS fees.

As I remember the charge for the larger stations was \$1000 and that the ASCAP percentage was 45 percent. That would make \$450 as a flat fee.

On television, really, I think that we feel that this is such a small amount of stations, if there are any, that whatever figure you come up with has to be arbitrary. Yes, you can divide some numbers which takes into account the television fee rather than the radio fee by a number of stations. I would only point out we have always had some

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

conflict in the number of licensees and the number of stations. There are difficulties in doing that.

I guess that the best way to do it, if you really feel it is worthwhile, even though it amounts to such a small amount of money, and it really isn't worth this attention, is to take an artificial figure. If you just do it in rough, you can get the 3,000 or you can get to something like that as an annual fee by dividing something by something, but that's about where we may come out.

As far as other licensees are concerned, to now get to the Italian Book Company.

> CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Let's come back to that. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Mr. Chairman, I move that we amend or add to actually to Section 304.3, two new sections; Section C -- Subsection C, which would read -- and we'll clean up the language later -- "In the event that in the future an unaffiliated radio station or a new station becomes a member of NPR the basic rate described in Section A shall be increased by the amount ASCAP would have received from said station under 304.6 and 304.7."

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioners have heard --. COMMISSIONER JAMES: Want me to give them to you one at a time?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Yes. Let's dispose of radio and then we'll come to television.

Commissioners have heard the amendment. discussion on the amendment?

25

"aye".

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: All those in favor will say

(A chorus of "ayes".)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Commissioner James?

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Adding further to Section 304.3, a new Subsection D, that "In the event a new television station becomes a member of the Public Broadcasting Service System, that at that time the matter will be brought before the Tribunal for a determination at that time of the royalty rates that will be paid and added to the basic formula as defined in Subsection A of this section."

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioners have heard the amendment on this amendment. The Chair would welcome any comments that Public Broadcasting or ASCAP might care to make.

MR. ALIENIKOFF: May I make a statement?
CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Mr. Alienikoff.

MR. ALIENIKOFF: Again, just to repeat, Commissioner James, this is such a minor kind of a happening, in our view, of what could happen, of whether it is one station or two stations, that the whole concept comes back to the Tribunal for additional consideration of what the possibilities would be. It seems to us it would just be an exercise that might not be worth it to ASCAP or to ourselves or to the Tribunal.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think we would prefer to see some sort of arrangements like what you have said for radio rather than to go through that kind of a procedure.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Mr. Korman, do you wish to be heard in this?

MR. KORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think there may be a problem with the statute as to whether you can now include in your rates and terms something --

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Would you want an analogy with the inflation adjustment?

MR. KORMAN: No, because this is a rate of term now being adopted and you are providing for a specific kind of adjustment.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Yes, but we are providing now that in the event certain thing occurs, that there shall be a proceeding before this body.

MR. KORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would not raise the question. I will say that on behalf of ASCAP. I do think -and we would welcome an opportunity to come back here short of five years with the public broadcasters, but I do think that there probably is an easier way to do it. What Mr. Smith had suggested and what I had agreed on, that whatever the Tribunal's pleasure is on this item, ASCAP will accede to.

COMMISSIONER BURG: Can't we devise an artificial figure to break --

COMMISSIONER JAMES: That's what he's doing right now. I'll withdraw my motion, Mr. Chairman.

25

his amendment on television. 2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Commissioner James? 3 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Yes. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: On your previous motion, 5 did you have a rate there per year, or for one period? 6 COMMISSIONER JAMES: It would be added to the 7 basic requirements. 8 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm talking about rates of radio and TV, I mean for unaffiliated stations. 9 COMMISSIONER JAMES: It would be added to the basic 10 rates. If somebody joins tomorrow, just add it to the formula 11 over --12 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. 13 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Coulter, do you 14 wish to offer --15 COMMISSIONER COULTER: May I just broach the concept initially? This is taking into account both Mr. 16 Smith's -- what I perceive was his initial proposal and Mr. 17 Alienikoff's desire for simplicity and that's respecting the 18 fact that there were radio funds in the figure that we 19 cited or established earlier, and then simply assign some 20 flat figure to the addition of any television station. 21 would like to offer that as a possibility just to make 22 things simple. 23 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: How many television stations are there; six? 24

MR. SMITH: Right now?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James has withdrawn

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No; members.

MR. SMITH: The number of non-commercial educational television I believe is 276, but I could be off. I don't have it in my memory.

MR. ALIENIKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I have one further point. I hope that whatever regulation you provide would be both for a reduction in membership as well as an increase in membership. That is what we have had in the past and it is a perfectly possible thing to happen.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Have you any language you wish to suggest?

MR. ALIENIKOFF: Whatever the language that you were going to use and make it applicable to any increase or diminution or however you want to put it.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: How would you ascertain on the same share?

I'm talking about radio as well MR. ALIENIKOFF: as television both ways. We would prefer obviously not to do anything with this to be simple about it, but if we're going to go into anything, it would be fairer, we believe to have --

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James, do you accept that as being part of your amendment on radio --I think that's fair. COMMISSIONER JAMES:

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Would the Commissioner then include that in whatever language he supplies the Chair? COMMISSIONER JAMES: All right.

I would like to move that COMMISSIONER COULTER: the sum per added station to the PBS network be \$4,000 and

1 obviously if there is a decrease in stations, then subtract the \$4,000. 2 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioners have heard the 3 amendment. Any discussion? (No verbal response.) 5 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: All those in favor say, "aye". 6 (A chorus of ayes.) 7 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Opposed? 8 (No verbal response.) CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The ayes have it. The amendment 9 has been adopted. 10 Mr. Alienikoff invites our attention once again 11 to one of our favorite subjects, the Italian Book Corporation 12 and he raises a question which we have joked about in the 13 office, but it is a serious issue and it is the question 14 supposed that the Public Broadcasting System and NPR make 15 no use or little use of copyrighted compositions from that 16 repertoire, are they required to pay the \$600 fee. Mr. Alienikoff, would you care to suggest what 17 you would like in the way of a solution? 18 Yes. We would like to suggest MR. ALIENIKOFF: 19 that music controlled by the Italian Book Company or by any 20 other publisher that is not affiliated with ASCAP, BMI or 21 SESAC come within the confines of your section on per use. 22

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: As the record will indicate, gone back and forth on the Italian Book Company, and I will move that the section on the Italian Book Company be deleted from the final rule --

24

23

24

25

1 COMMISSIONER JAMES: That's 304.4. CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: 304.4; which will have the 2 result that Mr. Alienikoff desires. 3 Any debate on the amendment? 4 (No verbal response.) 5 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: All those in favor please 6 indicate. 7 (A chorus of ayes.) 8 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Opposed? (No verbal response.) 9 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The ayes have it. 10 Now, Mr. Alienikoff has another interesting 11 question for us to discuss this late in the day, namely the 12 effective date of the regulations. This body has been pro-13 ceeding as has most other people on the premise that the 14 final rules will become effective upon the date of publication 15 in the Federal Register, which if we comply with the statute, 16 should be June 8. But, whether it's June 8, June 9, or June 10, the issue is is that the effective date of this rule. 17 Mr. Alienikoff, I will be glad to hear your 18 argument on this issue. 19 MR. ALIENIKOFF: I'm afraid that this is a legal 20 matter and one of our lawyers can answer that. 21 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Mr. Latman. 22

MR. LATMAN: Section 809 of the Copyright Law is entitled: Effective Date of Final Determinations, and it appears to say quite clearly -- well, I won't say what it appears to say. I will read it, if I may.

"Any final determination by the Tribunal under this chapter shall become effective 30 days following its publication in the Federal Register as provided in Section 803 B." Then there is a clause that follows that says: "Unless certain things would happen before then."

803 B simply states: "Every final determination of the Tribunal shall be published in the Federal Register" and then proceeds to describe what the determinations shall include.

So, it would seem quite clear from the words of the statute that the determinations will become effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: It is quite clear, Mr. Latman, that you are selective in the words that you read from the statute. Would you, as I'm sure you were anticipating, now address yourself to Section 118 and analyze that language for us?

MR. LATMAN: 118 D(3) states: "Within six months, but not earlier than 120 days from the date of publication of notice specified in this subsection, the Copyright Royalty Tribunal shall make a determination and publish in the Federal Register a schedule of rates and terms which subject to clause two of this subsection, that's the voluntary provision, shall be binding on all owners of copyright and works specified by this subsection and public broadcasting entities regardless of whether or not such copyright owners and public broadcasting entities have submitted proposals to the Tribunal."

It was my reading of that that that doesn't state

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when it shall become effective. It states what shall be effective and on whom.

The other provision that I read, I thought addressed itself to the question of when such determination shall be effective.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: How do you interpret: "Shall be binding."

MR. LATMAN: I think the real thrust of it -first of all, "shall be binding" certainly is true. shall be binding within the timetable of the entire statute. I think the thrust of that, as I would read it, was that regardless of whether or not they appeared. I think that's the thrust of why it was put in that way, but I don't think there is any question that it shall be binding, except the question of when shall it become effective.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: I was diverted, Mr. Latman. Would you address yourself to Subclause 4, the sentence reading: "With respect to the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date of publication of such rates and terms."

Now, if we were to accept your argument, is it not reasonable that the Congress, at this point, would have said: "And, ending on the effective date of such rates and terms" if they intended the effective date to be a different date from the date of publication?

MR. LATMAN: You certainly could argue that. Again, I think the thrust, and you, of course, Mr. Chairman, are more familiar with this than I --

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: No, I think your colleagues at the table are much more familiar with Section 118 than I am.

MR. LATMAN: It is really again addressing itself to the freezing of rights until publication.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If we accept your argument, the Congress has provided this ridiculous result that you have the benefit of the status quo until the rates are published in the Federal Register, but for the 28 or 29 days between the publication and the effective date, the special protection that the Congress felt you were entitled to no longer exists.

Isn't that a necessary conclusion from your analysis?

MR. LATMAN: It may be. You mean we take our chances during the 29 days?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: I'm not suggesting that the Congress intended that. It would seem that would have to be the conclusion that would be reached.

MR. LATMAN: I would suspect that again, this clause was focusing on the freezing provision whereas the Title VIII, the Chapter 8 provisions, were focusing on the kind of questions that are now before the Tribunal; the nuts and bolts of Tribunal action and what the Tribunal does, and when its action becomes effective.

I would agree with you that the Clause 4 that you read seems a little inconsistent with that. I would think that the provision using that old concept that the provision that addresses itself specifically to a question

should govern and Section 809 does just that.

argument that it's Section 118 which provides an entire schedule for this proceeding, starting with when the initial notice must be published, indicating the period in which we must conduct the proceeding, when the proceeding must be concluded and now to argue that when it gets to the effective date you ignore the language in Section 118 and look elsewhere, I cannot accept.

MR. LATMAN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand that. I don't think you should ignore it. But, there are a lot of other provisions of Chapter VIII which have been operative right throughout, such as membership for the Tribunal, procedures of the Tribunal. In other words, you have integrated those into Section 118 as you proceeded.

Now when the time comes for a determination, I would suggest that you integrate the time determination provision in 809 into 118 also.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Other than for giving Public Broadcasting three or four weeks without having to pay under this schedule, what practical advantages would flow from this interpretation? Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: There is a provision, and I'm not suggesting this is going to happen. I think the structure of it is that before the 30 days expires, there isn't the opportunity for any party to this proceeding, or people who are not parties presumably, to appeal. If the rate is effective -- the anomaly would result that if you appeal and

the rate is affected back, that there might be -- and since the court can vacate at that point, there would be a three-week period of liability followed by a vacation of the rate, it would get just equally as confusing there, I would think.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Your request, or your interpretation is not motivated by desire to allow an opportunity for a comment on the final rule. It's just the concern that you just enumerated?

MR. SMITH: We have not discussed, and it is certainly not motivated by a determination to comment.

MR. ALIENIKOFF: Mr. Chairman, may we ask what was in the Tribunal's mind about that? We have not been uncertain about what the Tribunal's procedures are bound to be.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: As to the question of publishing the rule for comment?

MR. ALIENIKOFF: Yes.

would certainly favor that course of action. I suspect most, if not all of my colleagues would, but if we accept our interpretation of 118, that we're required to complete this proceeding within six months, it would appear that it would be ignoring the intent of Congress for us to further extend this proceeding.

I would personally welcome that possibility, but I think it's been precluded by the statute.

Mr. Korman?

MR. KORMAN: We support what you have said, and

3.

my counsel, Mr. Koenigsburg, calls attention to 804 C. It seems to be a specific provision in Chapter VIII which Mr. Latman was looking for, and which says: "With respect to proceedings under 801 D (1), concerning the determination of reasonable terms and rates of royalty payments as provided in Section 118, the Tribunal shall proceed when and as provided by that section", which I think is further support for the Chairman's view.

MR. LATMAN: That, of course, is the timetable. That's 1982 and your six-month provision. I think there is no question the title is: Institution and Conclusion of Proceeding.

MR. ALIENIKOFF: That's 804 A and B.

MR. KORMAN: No, no, no, no. That's not what it says.

MR. LATMAN: In other words, the timetable of what the Tribunal does, I think, is spelled out clearly in 118. The question of when it becomes effective I think is covered by 809.

MR. KORMAN: 801 also, and it refers again to 801 B, the Section D(1), to Section 118 as the guiding light for the Tribunal and as to the effective date.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair has indicated his interpretation of Section 118 and the effective date. Does any Commissioner disagree with the Chairman's position as to the effective date?

MR. KORMAN: Of course, Mr. Chairman, it may all be academic, because the Public Broadcasters, as evidenced by

24

25

the record, have made a side agreement to pay from January 1. 1978 anyway, on the basis of these terms and conditions. 2 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: We thank you for that reminder. 3 MR. ALIENIKOFF: Mr. Chairman, could that remark be erased from the record? MR. KORMAN: Absolutely not. 6 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Let's move on. 7 No Commissioner has indicated --8 COMMISSIONER JAMES: I agree with you, Tom. the record; I agree with the Chairman. 9 COMMISSIONER COULTER: I accept the Chairman's 10 interpretation. 11 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Unless otherwise determined, 12 the effective date will be the date of publication in the 13 Federal Register. 14 The separate question which arose in this dis-15 cussion is the desirability of publishing the rule for 16 comment before making it effective, perhaps 30 days after publication. Assuming that we have that discretion under 17 Section 118, which is far from clear, is there any disposition 18 on the part of Commissioners to publish this rule for comment 19 before final adoption? 20 COMMISSIONER BURG: How long is the comment 21 period? 22

(A discussion was held off the record.)

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Mr. Chairman, I move that the rules that have been entered into the record be adopted at this time as the proposed rules of this Tribunal and that

they be published in the Federal Register tomorrow or as soon as possible after today and that from that first date of publication that any interested party be given 14 days to file a comment to said proposed rules and that at the conclusion of that period of time this Tribunal meet to make its final determination on adoption.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: You have heard the motion which I interpret, Commissioner, to be the proposed rule in whatever condition it is at the end of this particular meeting, because there may well be other changes at the remainder of this session.

Do any Commissioners wish to speak on the motion of Commissioner James?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, I believe we should have a recorded vote.

Mr. Latman?

MR. LATMAN: Would you accept a comment at this point?

The Chairman mentioned that before this motion was made the legal or statutory question of whether that could be done within the time frame of 118 --

MR. KORMAN: I didn't hear, Mr. Latman.

MR. LATMAN: I'm sorry. I said the Chairman had questioned, I thought, threw open the question of open issue of whether the Tribunal had jurisdiction to do that in view of the statutory timetable. I, for one, would think respectfully they do not, that the provision for determination by the

six-month period means a determination.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The language which you have in front of you reads: "Within six months -- and I'm skipping a clause -- the Tribunal shall make a determination and publish in the Federal Register a schedule of rates and terms which shall be binding."

Obviously it's not binding unless it's a final

Mr. Korman, do you wish to be heard in this

MR. KORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Professor Latman.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Yes. I, as Mr. Latman indicated in my initial introduction to this subject felt we had the same problem with the statute, although I think Commissioner James is making an excellent suggestion in terms of orderly procedure and allowing comments by the parties.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Yes. I think the problem came about by virtue of the fact that the President didn't make the appointments on time, as all of us know. This should have been done prior to this time and I think under the traditional language of certain provisions of the APA Act, that generally what you have suggested, Mr. Latman, you do have comments.

I have raised this question before early on in the proceedings, early on when their were continuances asked for which were going to push us back to where we are right

22

23

24

25

now; tomorrow. But, again, I think it is the intent of this 2 Tribunal to try to be as fair to the parties as they can 3 possibly be. To permit comment pursuant to the Administrative 4 Procedure Act, I think is probably in order, and if Public 5 Broadcasting or ASCAP wants to go to the Court of Appeals, 6 they still have that right to do it. CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Any further debate on the 7 Commissioner's position? 8 Off the record. 9 (A discussion was held off the record.) 10 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Some Commissioners are suffering 11 the pains of hunger at this time and we will recess at the 12 call of the Chair and we will be back in ten minutes. 13 (A short recess was held.) 14 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The meeting will resume. Commissioner James? 15 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Mr. Chairman, after subsequent 16 legal analyzation I'll withdraw my motion. 17 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Does any party seek recognition 18 at this time to discuss other issues in the proposed final 19 rule? 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Chairman?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia?
COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Off the record.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James has

requested that there be separate vote on one section of the

proposed rule, Section 3, pertaining to the performance of the ASCAP repertoire.

We will vote now on whether we shall adopt Section 3 as previously amended. A yea vote is a vote to adopt Section 3.

Commissioner?

getting ready to take a vote on the entire proposal, right?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair understands that

Commissioner James has asked that prior to the vote on the

final adoption of the proposed rule, that there be a separate

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Just a minute. We are now

vote on Section 3.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: No. I think an easier way to do it, Mr. Chairman, is to vote on the total package except for Section 3. Get approval on that and then put Section 3 up for a vote.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We've already done that the other way, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: That would require, Commissioner a third vote to adopt the entire proposed rule.

I would think we're going to waste more time talking about how the vote should occur. The Chair would suggest that we, if you desire, have a separate vote on Section 3 and then --

COMMISSIONER JAMES: We already voted on Section 3, hadn't we?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: No. We did not vote separately on the entire section. We voted on several amendments to

Section 3 in the course of the meeting.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: I see there is going to be a problem.

The Section 3 as it stands now, there has been a vote taken on it. There has been two amendments to Section 3.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: At least.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: How do you propose to do it now so that we can get the whole thing approved as to the sections that we are all in agreement on and those sections that we are not agreed upon?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: There is no requirement based on the Administrative Procedure Act or the past practice of this Agency that we have a separate vote on each section of either a proposed rule or a final rule.

If it was not for the Commissioner's intervention we would now proceed to a vote on the adoption of the final rule, but the Commissioner is within his right in asking for a separate vote on one or more sections of the final rule.

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: I take it the Commissioner requests a separate vote on Section 3?

COMMISSIONER JAMES: Right.

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair previously defined the motion, but I will repeat it. We are voting on whether Section 3 as amended shall be accepted.

COMMISSIONER BURG: That includes both subsections A and B?

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: It includes all of the amendments 1 that were accepted in the course of this meeting. 2 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Mr. Chairman, so that I can 3 understand it; if I disagree with Section A and B and I agree 4 with section C and D --5 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Commissioner is entitled 6 to have a further break down to have separate votes on each subsection. 7 COMMISSIONER JAMES: I so request. You can 8 lump them in twos if you like. CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: There is also an "E" now, 10 because the old "C" is now "E". There is what's now an "E" 11 on the following page. 12 COMMISSIONER JAMES: What is "D" now? 13 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The recordkeeping; the former 14 "C". 15 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Oh, yes. I just wondered if it would be easier just to 16 vote no on 304.3. 17 Put it back up. I'll just vote no for the whole 18 thing. 19 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Again, the vote is on whether 20 we should adopt 304.E --21 COMMISSIONER COULTER: 304.3. 22 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: .3, yes. Commissioner Coulter? 23 COMMISSIONER COULTER: Yes. 24 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Burg? 25

COMMISSIONER BURG: Yes. 1 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James? 2 COMMISSIONER JAMES: No. 3 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia? COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No. 5 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair votes aye. 6 ayes are three, nays are two. The section is adopted. 7 Are there any further requests for separate votes. (No verbal response.) 8 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: If not, we will proceed to the 9 vote on the final adoption of the rule. 10 Commissioner Coulter? 11 COMMISSIONER COULTER: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Burg? 13 COMMISSIONER BURG: Yes. 14 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner James? COMMISSIONER JAMES: With the exception to the 15 previous vote, yes. 16 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner Garcia? 17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: With exception to 304.3, 18 yes. 19 CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The Chair votes yes. 20 ayes are five. The nays are none. The rule has been adopted 21 and will become effective according to our interpretation as of the date of publication in the Federal Register. 22 Commissioner Burg, I believe, has a request. 23 COMMISSIONER BURG: I would like to move that the 24 Chairman be authorized to make whatever technical and perfecting

23

24

25

amendments to this document, to make whatever technical and perfecting amendments necessary. CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: You have heard the motion of the Commissioner. Is there any debate? (No verbal response.) CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: All those in favor, say "aye". (A chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Opposed. (No verbal response.) CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: The motion is adopted. Mr. Korman. MR. KORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like -- I assume no other Commissioner wishes to be heard, because what I say now is intended, from the standpoint of this party, to be an expression of our appreciation for the dedication, the very evident hard work that the Tribunal has performed and the unfailing courtesy with which sometimes long-winded counsel for this party and the witnesses were heard. Thank you, very much. CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Thank you. MR. LATMAN: Mr. Chairman, in order not to confirm Mr. Korman's characterization of counsel, Public Broadcasting joins in that statement. We all thank counsel and the witnesses for their

CHAIRMAN BRENNAN: Thank you, very much.

The Chair thanks his colleagues for their assistance. unfailing cooperation and good humor.

We have throughout this proceeding devided the

the responsibilities, performing the staff work ourselves.

Other than for the assistance of our secretaries and the transition officer, the Chairman has had the special responsibility of being the messenger down to the Federal Register, which chore I shall perform again later this week.

If there is nothing further to come before this body, we will recess until 10:00 a.m., June 21. The meeting is recessed.

(Whereupon, at 6:35 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)